DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 416 CE 039 463

AUTHOR	Iutcovich, Joyce Miller
TITLE	Assessment of the Impact of the Bureau of Vocational Education's Program for Disadvantaged Populations in Pennsylvania. October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Inst. of Research, Erie, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 84
CONTRACT	83-4007
NOTE	122p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Education; Disabilities; *Disadvantaged; Educational Finance; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Evaluation Methods; Inservice Teacher Education; Outcomes of Education; Postsecondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Program Improvement; Secondary Education; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This project assessed the impact of the Bureau of Vocational Education's Program for Disadvantaged Populations in Pennsylvania during the period 1979-1982. Data gathered from each funded project via a mailed questionnaire were both quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. In addition, on-site visits to 10 projects produced additional qualitative data and provided greater insight into vocational education for the disadvantaged. The research showed that the program had strength, integrity, and a high-quality, motivated staff; that it served a variety of needs within the target population, although the major focus was on improving academic skills and skill training; and that adequate records were maintained to document service delivery. However, the program's greatest difficulty was in regard to program objectives and procedures. The researchers concluded that this problem lies not in the individual programs and their specific objectives and procedures, but rather with the vagueness of the state goals and subgoals. Recommendations for improvement included development of specific measurable objectives for education of disadvantaged populations in the state, implementation of an evaluation system, more contact between the Bureau of Vocational Education and funded programs, improvement of the image of vocational education, earlier introduction of career education, and improvement of education for teachers of the disadvantaged. (Appendixes, amounting to almost half of the document, include the research instrument, interview schedule, data tables, scaling procedure, and list of site visits.) (KC)

ED247416

PA8413107

AUG 27 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B Ford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL REPORT

ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF THE BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA

(Contract Number 83-4007)

Joyce Miller Iutcovich, Ph.D.

NORTHWEST INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA 16502

October 1, 1983 — June 30, 1984

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT
FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CE039463

DISCLAIMER

This study was supported in whole or in part by the United States Department of Education, through the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE), Bureau of Vocational Education. However, the conclusions reached and recommendations made herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the United States Office of Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE), or the Bureau of Vocational Education and no official endorsement should be inferred.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this project was due to many individuals and organizations. The cooperation of the federally funded programs for the disadvantaged that were a part of this project was greatly appreciated. Recognition and thanks extended to the project directors, staff and students of these programs who aided our data collection.

Thanks is also extended to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Education. The guidance and encouragement of Carroll Curtis and Clara Gaston was greatly appreciated.

Finally, a special thank you is offered to the staff of the Northwest Institute of Research, whose diligent work and dedication made this project possible: They are: Susan Vaughn, Khalil Rabat, Mark Iutcovich, Wendy Kinross and Vicki Lopez.

Joyce Miller Iutcovich, Ph.D.
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Disclaimer		ii
Acknowledgements		iii
List of Tables		v
Abstract		vi
1.0	Background	1
2.0	Conceptualization of Problem	10
2.1	Project Purpose	10
2.2	Conceptual Framework	10
2.2.1	Program Implementation	11
2.2.2	Impact/Outcome Assessment	13
3.0	Methodology	16
3.1	Data Collection	16
3.2	Limitation of Effort	17
4.0	Analysis	19
4.1	Sample Background	19
4.2	Programs Selected for Site Visits	24
4.3	Program Implementation	24
4.3.1	Qualifications of Staff	25
4.3.2	Intensity of Treatment	26
4.3.3	Focus of Programmatic Effort	28
4.3.4	Clarity of Program Plan	31
4.3.5	Link Between Program Objectives and Procedures	33
4.3.6	Staff Commitment	34
4.3.7	Supervisory Plan	35
4.3.8	Documentation of Service Delivery	36
4.4	Impact/Outcome Assessment	38
5.0	Conclusions and Recommendations	49
6.0	Dissemination	58
7.0	References	59

Appendix A Research Instrument
Appendix B Interview Schedule
Appendix C Tables
Appendix D Scaling Procedure for Determining Quality of Staff
Appendix E List of Site Visits

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1a:	Distribution of Federal Vocational Funds for the Disadvantaged 1979-80 to 1981-82.....	7
Table 1b:	Enrollment of Disadvantaged Students in Vocational Education, 1979-82.....	8
Table 1:	Response Rate from Survey According to Program Area.....	20
Table 2:	Programs Receiving Funding for Fiscal Years.....	20
Table 3:	Program Areas by Fiscal Years Funded.....	Appendix C
Table 4:	Total Amount of Funding Over Three Fiscal Years.....	21
Table 5:	Amount of Funding in Each Program Area for 1979-80.....	Appendix C
Table 6:	Amount of Funding in Each Program Area for 1980-81.....	Appendix C
Table 7:	Amount of Funding in Each Program Area for 1981-82.....	Appendix C
Table 8:	Type of Disadvantaged Populations Served by Programs....	22
Table 9:	Percentage of Programs Using Specified Criteria to Determine Disadvantagement.....	23
Table 10:	Number of Students in all Program Areas for Each Fiscal Year.....	23
Table 11:	Quality Rating of Staff in All Program Areas.....	26
Table 12:	Quality Rating of Staff within Each Program Area.....	Appendix C
Table 13:	Intensity of Treatment for All Program Areas.....	27
Table 14:	Procedures Used to Determine Needs of Target Population.	29
Table 15:	Needs of Disadvantaged Population Addressed by All Program Areas.....	30
Table 16:	Motivation of Staff in Each Program Area.....	Appendix C

List of Tables
Page 2

		Page
Table 17:	Type of Records Documenting Service Delivery.....	37
Table 18:	Type of Evaluative Data Gathered.....	38
Table 19:	Types of Evidence Documenting Accomplishment of Program Objectives.....	40
Table 20:	Reported Rates of Success on Expected Outcomes.....	41
Table 21:	Student Satisfaction with the Program as Perceived by Project Director.....	43
Table 22:	Student Satisfaction with Current Programs.....	44
Table 23:	Types of Changes within School System.....	46

ABSTRACT

a. Title of Project: Assessment of the Impact of the Bureau of Vocational Education's Program for Disadvantaged Populations in Pennsylvania

b. Submitted By: Northwest Institute of Research
434 West Eighth Street
Erie, Pennsylvania 16502
(814) 459-8347

c. Total Funds (Federal) Requested: $19,651

d. Proposed Beginning and Ending Dates: October 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984

e. Summary:

(1) Objectives of Project

The purpose of this project was to assess the impact of the Bureau of Vocational Education's Program for Disadvantaged Populations in Pennsylvania. The research effort was directed at determining if the state's strategy for the three-year period-1979 through 1982-significantly impacted upon the problems of the disadvantaged and if it is necessary to continue such efforts.

(2) Procedure and Description of Project

The project consisted of a research effort that combined both implementation and impact assessments. Data gathered from each funded project via a mailed questionnaire was both quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. Furthermore, on-site visits of ten projects produced additional qualitative data and provided greater insight into vocational education for the disadvantaged.

(3) Expected Contribution to Education

The results of this study will add to the already existing information and research base that is maintained by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. For Pennsylvania, this information will be used for the future planning and development of vocational education - only through such research efforts can more effective decision-making be accomplished.

(4) Products to be Delivered

The final product produced by this project is a technical report submitted to the Research Coordinating Unit of the Pennsylvania Department of Education and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

1.0 BACKGROUND

> I believe... that morality, compassion, generosity, are innate elements of the human constitution; that there exists a right independent of force; that a right to property is founded in our natural wants, in the means with which we are endowed to satisfy these wants, and the right to what we acquire by those means without violating the similar rights of other sensible beings; that no one has a right to obstruct another, exercising his faculties innocently for the relief of sensibilities made a part of his nature; that justice is the fundamental law of society; that the majority, oppressing an individual, is guilty of a crime, abusing its strength, and by acting on the law of the strongest breaks up the foundation of society ... (Thomas Jefferson, as cited by Glittles, 1964).

The minority group in the public schools of the United States has been labeled the "disadvantaged" or "culturally deprived" since the early sixties. The evidence is abundant that these students have been oppressed and abused by our past and present educational system. The disadvantaged are those people who are limited. Our American philosophy of education is viewed as the means to an enlargement of individual freedom. It is felt that this American subculture (the disadvantaged) can be liberated to achieve self-respect, a productive place in society, and a positive view of reality when the inequalies in education are no longer present.

Edmund W. Gordon has described the situation as follows:

> "Disadvantage," ...is rooted in the condition of poverty and discrimination in which the child grows up. He is in an American subculture, that

> of poverty or low status, which has inadequately prepared him to function in the middle-class world of employment and suburban living or, in our frame of reference, for functioning effectively in the educational system. Youngsters are "disadvantaged" in the sense that the preparation they receive is inadequate for successful competition in the larger society (Howard, 1966: 66).

These are the students that our schools have failed to educate. Coles states:

> Though these children come from various racial, geographic, and cultural backgrounds they share at least one fate. They are poor in relation to the rest of the nation, and their schooling is likely to be or to have been faulty (Coles, 1966: 58).

Widespread attention and concern has been given to these disadvantaged students and their families. The contemporary philosophy of education has evolved to accepting the responsibility for educating the disadvantaged student. The numerous dimensions of education have been explored by researchers who have attempted to analyze the characteristics of the disadvantaged student in relationship to the following areas: social and economic status; home environment; mental health; language and cognitive development; equality of opportunity; physically handicapped; learning disabilities; and remediation in the disadvantaged student, to name the basic categories.

Who is disadvantaged? Havighurst says it is anyone who is culturally deprived, intellectually deprived, and the socially disadvantaged. It is a child that "...has a disadvantage relative to some other child for some kind of social life - disadvantaged for living competently in an urban, industrial, and democratic society" (Havighurst, 1965: 39).

Disadvantaged students have been identified by teachers and administrators for many years. They point out the distinguishing characteristic of these students in the schools by:

> ...low academic achievement, high transiency, deviant language patterns, irregular attendance, discipline problems and lack of communication with the parents.
>
> Although these same problems are prevalent in other areas, the degree of severity appears to be much greater in schools which we now identify as those serving disadvantaged pupils. (Spears and Pivnich, 1964: 245-246).

The disadvantaged students have come to our attention in the schools because of their low-achievement. One then asks why the low-achievement? The frequent answer has been that these students and their families do not value education. Several writers and researchers have found evidence to dispute this (Riessman, Cloward and Jones).

Riessman (1965: 163) says that there is evidence of a positive attitude toward education but that the deprived are alienated from the school because schools have not been responding to them. Their values for education are not the same as those that the middle class hold. The key to their interest in education is their desire to cope with everyday life and achieve mastery of the complex world (Riessman, 1962: 13).

Cloward and Jones cite differing value patterns which the schools failed to take into account which resulted in striking inequality (Cloward and Jones, 1963: 193). The inequality was in the form of: unequal educational

facilities; individual differences in learning patterns which are not taken into account during the teaching process; and the educational system which is organized to favor only one part of the social structure.

Riessman (1962: 5-6) identified this inequality as the factor causing the alienation from the school as felt by the deprived student and his family. In the past there was also lack of school know-how, which created an ambivalence toward education. The inequality was found in the classrooms, parent-teacher association, guidance offices, psychological testing, and in practically every realm of these students' experiences.

Indeed, it was during the late 1950s and early 1960s that the special needs of disadvantaged groups came into sharp focus. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 recognized that some children and adults may require specialized programs and services in order to become functioning members of society and to earn a living. The 1968 and 1976 Vocational Amendments specified that a portion of the basic grants to states be for training persons with special needs.

In order to identify the disadvantaged, the staff of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, defined the criteria by which disadvantaged learners should be identified under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. This system was designed to include persons who "1) have academic or economic disadvantages and 2) require special services, assistance or programs in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs" (Federal Register, October 3, 1977: 53851).

In more detail, the disadvantaged are identified in terms of the following:

> Individuals who are considered academically disadvantaged are those who do not have adequate skills to succeed at the time of entrance into or while enrolled in a vocational program. Due to poor education preparation, they require supportive services or special programs to enable them to meet the requirements for entrance into the program or to continue and complete the program.
>
> There are three groups of learners who would be considered in this category. They include learners who:
> - lack reading and writing skills
> - lack mathematical skills or
> - perform below grade level
>
> Economically disadvantaged learners are described as those:
> - whose family income is at or below the national poverty level;
> - participants or parent or guardian of the participant ... is unemployed;
> - participants, or parent of participant, is a recipient of public assistance;
> - who ... are institutionalized or under State guardianship
>
> The effects of poverty on successful learning are more difficult to pinpoint than those caused by academic disadvantages. It has been suggested that one effect may be on attitudes, motivation or behavior which would reflect on a student's ability to succeed in a program, and therefore, reduce chances of subsequent employment (Resurge '79, 1979, 21-23).

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Amendments of 1976 have continued to provide funding to meet the needs of a seemingly increasing segment of our society. The major purpose of the 1976 Vocational

Education Amendments was to extend and revise the 1963 Vocational Education Act. The intent of the federal legislation for meeting the needs of the disadvantaged is also found in the Pennsylvania State Plan for Vocational Education of 1978-1982, Goal VIII and the five Subgoals for the disadvantaged and the handicapped.

Goal VIII Develop and Expand Vocational Education Opportunities for the Disadvantaged and Handicapped.

Vocational education has a vital and growing responsibility in the total effort of the educational system to prepare all students for work. Therefore, the State Board reaffirms its position that vocational educators must continue the development and expansion of programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped. It is essential that these persons have the same educational opportunities as all others benefiting from public education.

The State Board recognizes that special support services may need to be provided to the handicapped and disadvantaged. Whenever possible, mainstreaming these students into the regular program is desired. Architectural barriers must be removed wherever possible for the physically handicapped and modifications to equipment should be made to provide for students' special needs. In addition, remedial education may be necessary if the disadvantaged and handicapped are to benefit equally from vocational education.

SUBGOALS:

VIII.1 Provide remedial and supportive vocational services for disadvantaged and handicapped students to foster their placement in regular vocational education programs.

VIII.2 Modify regular vocational education programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped students.

VIII.3 Develop special vocational education programs based on the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped students.

VIII.4 Provide more vocational education opportunities in areas of the state which have a high concentration of youth unemployment and/or school dropouts.

VIII.5 Promote exploratory (hands-on) pre-vocational programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students.

As specified in the federal guidelines, a minimum of 20 percent of the federal funds should be spent for the disadvantaged. Pennsylvania has been in compliance with these guidelines; for the fiscal years 79-80 to 81-82 the total expenditure of federal funds for the disadvantaged can be found in Table Ia.

Table Ia: Distribution of Federal Vocational Education Funds for the Disadvantaged 1979-80 to 1981-1982.

FISCAL YEAR	EXPENDITURE
1979-80	$4,751,378.00
1980-81	$6,572,714.00
1981-82	$7,800,917.00

Source: Summaries of Disadvantaged Proposals, 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82. Bureau of Vocational Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

The number of disadvantaged students served in Pennsylvania is shown in Table Ib.

Table Ib: Enrollment of Disadvantaged Students in Vocational Education, 1979-1982.

YEAR	ENROLLMENT
1979	53,960
1980	55,133
1981	62,471
1982	54,447

Source: Fourteenth Annual Evaluation Report, PACVE, 1983:39.

It is important to note that Pennsylvania has, over the fiscal years identified, expanded its vocational education services to the disadvantaged. Moreover, despite an overall decline in vocational education enrollment, the enrollment of disadvantaged students has increased (Fourteenth Annual Evaluation Report, PACVE, 1983:39).

One might ask if the magnitude of Pennsylvania's effort matches the needs of the disadvantaged population. This cannot be easily determined since the task of objectively identifying the size of the disadvantaged group as well as their needs has not been completed on a statewide level.

Another question of importance to address concerns the impact of the federally funded programs for the disadvantaged in Pennsylvania. This question is addressed in this research project. The sections of this report that follow describe the following elements of this research project: the Conceptual Framework (Section 2.0); Methodology (Section 3.0); Analysis (Section 4.0); and Conclusions and Recommendations (Section 5.0).

2.0 CONCEPTUALIZATION OF PROBLEM

2.1 PROJECT PURPOSE

The purpose of this project was to examine the impact of the federally funded vocational programs for disadvantaged populations in Pennsylvania. The major issue addressed in this study concerned the extent to which the state's strategy for disbursing funds resulted in "significant and lasting improvements in the capacity of vocational education programs in Pennsylvania... to significantly impact upon the problems of the disadvantaged." (RFP: 2)

This research problem was interpreted as a question regarding policy implementation and policy outcomes. Therefore, this study utilized a conceptual framework that allowed for the study of the quality of implementation of individual vocational programs for the disadvantaged as well as program impact within the individual programs as well as state level. It was deemed necessary to combine these two approaches in order to address the question asked by the Bureau of Vocational Education. In essence, it is important to, first, provide evidence of program implementation in order to have an interpretational framework whereby outcome/impact data can be analyzed.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The assessment of program implementation requires documenting the treatment -- i.e., if the service was delivered, to whom it was delivered, how it was delivered, and the extent to which participants received the intended service.

The assessment of impact requires documenting the success of the funded programs in meeting their stated objectives or meeting the needs of the target population. On the state level, it means determining the extent to which significant and lasting improvements have occurred within the educational system.

Undoubtedly, the importance of implementation evidence lies in the interpretation of outcome (success) measures. This is particularly true if the outcome evidence reveals that a program failed to produce its intended effects. Lack of implementation strength and integrity can be the reason why program success was not present. Moreover, such evidence can be invaluable when decision makers need to address program improvement. Outcome data, alone, cannot provide the information needed for decision makers regarding what is right or wrong with programs, and the possible avenues for improving the effectiveness of programs.

What follows is a detailed description of the conceptual framework which guided this research effort. It is important to note that these concepts were transformed into variables that were measured at the individual program level. An aggregation of these individual measures, hence, provided an overall picture of the state's system of vocational education for disadvantaged populations.

2.2.1 Program Implementation

The term implementation refers to a process of change that occurs after the adoption of a policy (i.e., the State Plan which targeted

setaside funds for the disadvantaged and funded proposed programs) and before the routinization of operations, activities or tasks that are governed by the policy (Schneider, 1982:716). The most critical issue in studying implementation is how the quality or adequacy of the implementation can be determined. In the approach we are using (Yeaton & Redner, 1981), the success of implementation is to be considered in terms of two general factors:

A. STRENGTHS OF PROGRAMMATIC EFFORTS: the presence and functioning of the necessary elements delineated in a program which, in a priori grounds, link the programmatic efforts to expected outcomes. The critical parameters to be included in this assessment of strength are:

- qualifications of staff: the past experience or formal degree of attainment of the program providers; also staff training procedures and staff motivation and dedication to the program were included.
- intensity: the frequency and duration of treatment for the recipients.
- focus of programmatic efforts: the breadth of effort (i.e., broad or narrow) or the number of needs of the target population addressed by the program(s).
- clarity of program plan: the presence of a (useful and understandable) protocol (PDE guidelines) for the implementation and operation of a program.

B. INTEGRITY OF PROGRAMMATIC EFFORTS: the extent that a program is delivered as intended - the fidelity of program implementation. The critical parameters for assessing integrity are:

- the program plan: if the plan clearly and specifically delineates the links between service provided and the expected impact of the program. For example, if vocational training is intended to improve the employment opportunities through increased skill, then the acquisition of the skill is the mediating process and it is also important to determine if it actually occurred.

- staff commitment: if the delivery staff cooperate in the implementation of the program; for example, high rates of staff turnover or absenteeism or a lack of motivation would suggest a general lack of job commitment.

- supervisory plan: if there is an adequate and well specified supervisory mechanism for monitoring the training of personnel, adherence to the treatment protocol, and verification of staff activities.

- documentation of service delivery: if there is information on training session occurrence, target population attendance, PDE guideline adherence, and total training time. This documentation may involve: forms for recording dates and places of sessions, attendance lists, video or tape recordings of sessions, observation of sessions by supervisors, and interviews with the recipients of the training.

2.2.2 Impact/Outcome Assessment

Primarily, impact assessment on an individual program level deals with the issue of success; specific questions that address this issue are:

- Did a change occur within the target population that could be attributed to the program?

- Was the program responsible for the observed change?

These questions direct us to the important elements that are needed to assess the immediate impact of a program:

- The identification of the objectives of a program (i.e., those behaviors of the program recipients which are the target of change).

- A measurement on the targeted behavior, ideally, both before entry into the program and after completion of the program.

Such measurements only indicate the answer to the first question, i.e., if a change did, indeed, occur. To answer the second question a more complex experimental design should have been employed but, due to time constraints, such a design could not be implemented in this study.

By necessity some of the impact measures in this study were specific to the individual programs under investigation. The study relied on the documented evidence maintained by the individual programs to answer the questions concerning program success as they relate to their own objectives. However, there were a number of more general outcomes which could be expected to result from vocational programs for the disadvantaged. Individual programs were requested to provide data if an outcome question was appropriate to their type of program and if data were available. The outcome questions were:

a. What proportion of the students were mainstreamed following program completion?

b. What proportion of students graduated with a high school diploma following program completion?

c. What proportion of the students acquired the expected academic skills following program completion?

d. What proportion of students were employed in training-related jobs six months following program completion?

e. What proportion of students were employed in jobs they consider acceptable, whether in training related fields or not, within six months following program completion?

f. What proportion of students had an enhanced self-image and self-confidence following program completion?

g. What proportion of students successfully completed your program? What criteria were used to judge success?

Along with these specific and general outcomes of individual programs, the study examined a much broader interpretation of impact -- i.e., if the system of vocational education for the disadvantaged has changed throughout the state as a result of this federal funding which provided the means to initially develop and implement the specialized programs. To measure this, it was necessary to determine what, if any, changes occurred within the individual programs and whether or not these changes indicated a permanent commitment to dealing with disadvantaged learners.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 DATA COLLECTION

The conceptual framework previously described provided a basis for developing a research instrument that was used to gather data from the federally funded vocational programs serving disadvantaged populations in Pennsylvania. All vocational programs that received federal funding during 1979-80, 1980-81, and/or 1981-82 were included in the original list of programs from which to gather data. However, many programs had carry-over funds from one year to the next, therefore a list of distinct programs was developed. This list included a whole array of programs in the designated funding areas - non-English speaking, secondary, post secondary, guidance, and special programs; each of the programs could have received funding for only one year, two years, or all three of the designated years. There were originally 390 distinct programs identified from the information provided by the Bureau of Vocational Education. All of the project directors/supervisors from these programs were mailed a survey and asked to complete the questions regarding: project's background information, project's target population, project's staffing, project's proposal and implementation, project's evaluation. (See Appendix A for a copy of the research instrument.) This instrument was developed by our research staff and consultants, and reviewed and approved by staff of the Bureau of Vocational Education. The instrument was pretested to insure its clarity and face validity for measuring the variables of interest. In addition to the data gathered directly from the mailed survey, a sample of programs from each of

the program areas was selected for a site visit. The intent was to identify two programs in each program area. However, in two of the program areas very few surveys were returned, therefore only one program in these two program areas was selected for a site visit. The process used for selecting programs to visit was the following: the surveys returned were reviewed, some programs that looked very exceptional were selected, and the remaining were selected randomly. The programs selected for a site visit, however, did have to have the program still intact; there was also an effort to select programs across the state, rather than visit programs in only one or two localized areas.

The purpose of the site visits was to provide a more indepth understanding of the program's operation, problems encountered, and their recommendations for improving vocational education for the disadvantaged. An interview schedule was developed which outlined topics for discussion and persons (groups) to interview. (See Appendix B for a copy of this interview schedule.)

A final source of data included documents and records maintained by the Bureau of Vocational Education - i.e., the program files, VEMIS data, Annual Evaluation Reports of Pennsylvania Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Accountability Reports and Vocational Education Guidelines for the Application of Federal Funds.

3.2 LIMITATION OF EFFORT

It must be understood that this research effort was carried out with limited resources and within a limited time frame. Many of the issues raised by the Bureau of Vocational Education - particularly the questions regarding

improvement in the capacity of vocational education to deal with the disadvantaged - are very difficult to answer without employing a more complex research design. Another difficulty in this study is that the programs are so varied in their purpose, objectives and procedures. Interpreting aggregated outcome data from such diverse units of analysis must be done very cautiously. Moreover, since the research was commissioned well after the programs started and ended, only documented evidence could be gathered and/or recall data from project directors and staff. As such, the content validity of the data cannot be accurately determined. And, in many instances, the outcome/impact data sought in this research was not kept by the programs or it was not readily available or only estimates were given by the program directors.

These are the most critical elements that limit the research effort and influence the manner in which the research questions can be answered. Within these limitations however, this research has utilized the best research design possible in order to gather evidence that was available, and to answer the questions that were posed.

4.0 ANALYSIS

The analysis of this data will follow the same format as presented in the conceptual framework (Section 2.2). The analysis, however, will begin with a discussion of the sample in terms of number of programs surveyed, program areas, fiscal years of funding, amount of funding and characteristics of the target population.

4.1 SAMPLE BACKGROUND

In total there were 268 surveys returned out of 390 mailed for a response rate of 69%. This rate of response was achieved after one follow-up (card) reminder. However, 32 of the surveys were returned incomplete for one of the following reasons: the program was never funded (13 surveys, therefore leaving 377 distinct programs receiving survey); there was no one available to complete survey (6 surveys); refusal to complete (3 surveys); survey was returned too late for tabulation (10 surveys). Therefore, only 236 completed surveys were used in the data analysis. Within these 236 surveys there may be some missing data, but for the most part, these surveys were complete enough to use in the analysis.

The program areas for those surveys returned, compared to the actual number of programs in each of these areas, is found in Table 1:

Table 1: Response Rate from Survey According to Program Area

PROGRAM AREA	# MAILED (%)	# RETURNED (%)
Limited-English Speaking	13 (3.4)	10 (4.2)
Secondary	266 (70.6)	173 (73.3)
Postsecondary	40 (10.6)	21 (8.9)
Guidance	29 (7.7)	17 (7.2)
Special Programs	19 (5.0)	13 (5.5)
Teacher Education	10 (2.7)	2 (.9)
TOTAL	377 (100%)	236 (100%)

It can be seen that the number of surveys returned in each category is comparable to the actual number in each of these program areas.

The programs surveyed were funded in either 1979-80, 1980-81, and/or 1981-82. Many programs did receive carry-over funds from one year to the next. Table 2 gives a breakdown of the number of programs in the sample and the fiscal years they received funding:

Table 2: Programs Receiving Funding for Fiscal Years

FISCAL YEAR(S)	# PROGRAMS (%)
1979-80	49 (20.8)
1980-81	8 (3.4)
1981-82	31 (13.1)
1979-80, 1980-81	26 (11.0)
1979-80, 1981-82	0 (0.0)
1980-81, 1981-82	32 (13.6)
1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82	90 (38.1)
TOTAL	236 (100%)

These data indicate that over one-third of the programs received funding for all three of the fiscal years. Indeed, almost half (46.8 percent) of the programs that received funding for all three years were secondary programs -- many of which were receiving entitlement funds. (See Appendix C, Table 3 for cross-tabulation of fiscal year by program area.) In addition, close to one-fourth (24.6 percent) of the programs received funding for at least two consecutive years and 37 percent of the programs only received funding for a single year. Special programs, guidance, and limited-English speaking programs were most likely to receive only a single year's funding.

Funding for these programs was examined separately for each fiscal year. Table 4 shows the total amount of funding received by the programs for each of the three fiscal years under investigation:

Table 4: Total Amount of Funding Over Three Fiscal Years

AMOUNT OF FUNDING	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Under $2,000	1 (.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
$2,001 - 10,000	18 (11.2)	23 (15.4)	24 (16.4)
$10,001 - 20,000	33 (20.6)	33 (22.0)	26 (17.8)
$20,001 - 40,000	48 (30.0)	42 (28.0)	43 (29.4)
$40,001 - 60,000	21 (13.1)	12 (8.0)	11 (7.5)
$60,001 - 80,000	10 (6.3)	14 (9.3)	9 (6.2)
$80,001 - 100,000	6 (3.8)	9 (6.0)	8 (5.5)
$100,001 - 150,000	7 (4.4)	6 (4.0)	16 (11.0)
Over $150,000	16 (10.0)	11 (7.3)	9 (6.2)
TOTAL	160 (100%)	150 (100%)	146 (100%)

Table 4 reveals that there has not been any dramatic change in the funding pattern over the three years; although in 1981-82 there was a moderate (7 percent) increase in the number of programs receiving between $100,001 - 150,000 in funding. A complete breakdown of funding for each fiscal year according to program area can be found in Tables 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix C.

The target population for these programs must have qualified as disadvantaged. Three categories of disadvantagement were: academic, economic, or limited-English speaking. Table 8 shows the breakdown in each of these categories and combinations thereof.

Table 8: Type of Disadvantaged Population Served by Programs

TYPE OF DISADVANTAGEMENT	# PROGRAMS (%)
Academic	87 (38.3)
Economic	5 (2.2)
Limited-English Speaking (LES)	6 (2.7)
Academic & Economic	110 (48.5)
Academic & LES	2 (.9)
Economic & LES	1 (.4)
Academic, Economic, & LES	16 (7.0)
TOTAL	227 (100%)

As expected, the greatest percentage of programs served populations who were considered both academically and economically disadvantaged. For the most part, disadvantagement was determined by math and reading skills and performance below grade level. Table 9 lists the various criteria used to determine disadvantagement in order of their priority.

Table 9: Percentage of Programs Using Specified Criteria to Determine Disadvantagement

CRITERIA	% OF PROGRAMS INDICATING USE
Reading Skills	79.2
Performance below grade level	76.8
Math Skills	72.1
Family income below poverty	50.0
P/P/G* on public assistance	25.4
P/P/G unemployed	22.3
Limited-English Speaking	12.1
Institutionalized	6.8
Other	29.2

* P/P/G = participant/parent/guardian

The total number of students participating in these programs was examined separately for each fiscal year. Table 10 presents the number of students in the programs for each of the fiscal years.

Table 10: Number of Students in all Program Areas for Each Fiscal Year

NUMBER OF STUDENTS	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
1 - 10	3 (2.0)	3 (2.1)	3 (2.1)
11 - 25	19 (12.6)	22 (15.5)	24 (16.7)
26 - 50	45 (29.8)	44 (31.0)	39 (27.1)
51 - 75	21 (13.9)	13 (9.2)	21 (14.6)
76 - 100	13 (8.6)	11 (7.7)	9 (6.3)
101 - 150	14 (9.3)	18 (12.7)	23 (16.0)
151 - 200	13 (8.6)	8 (5.6)	5 (3.5)
201 - 300	8 (5.3)	8 (5.6)	6 (4.1)
301 - 400	3 (2.0)	3 (2.1)	3 (2.0)
over 400	12 (7.9)	12 (8.5)	11 (7.6)
TOTAL	151 (100%)	142 (100%)	144 (100%)

The data does not reveal any significant changes in the number of students in these programs over the three years. Moreover, in each separate program area, if the total number of students is compared for each of the three fiscal years, there is no significant difference.

4.2 PROGRAMS SELECTED FOR SITE VISITS

As indicated previously, there were 10 programs visited across the state. Appendix E provides a list of the programs visited, the dates of the visit and the primary contact person. The primary purpose of these site visits was to gain an indepth understanding of their operation and to have personal, direct input from program staff with regard to the vocational education system for the disadvantaged as it operates in Pennsylvania. Thus, the intent was not to formally evaluate each of these programs as a separate entity. Indeed, much of the data from these site visits will be incorporated into the analysis sections of project implementation and impact.

4.3 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

In determining the strength and integrity of program implementation there were a number of variables examined: qualifications of staff, focus of programmatic effort, clarity of program plan, link between program objectives and outcomes, staff commitment, presence of supervisory plan and documentation of service delivery. The following presents the results of the analysis of these variables.

4.3.1 Qualifications of Staff

To determine the qualifications of staff, the program director was asked to complete the following information for the staff who had major responsibilities in the program:

- fiscal years in which the staff worked in the program
- position/title
- educational background
- number of years as a professional educator
- number of years working in program
- number of years of experience with disadvantaged populations
- number of special training programs (courses or workshops) attended (related to program's focus)
- number of days absent throughout duration of program

Based on this information, a scaling procedure was developed to determine an overall quality rating for staff in these positions: supervisory, teacher, counselor, aide/tutor. (See Appendix D for a complete description of the scaling procedure.) For tabulation purposes, the scale value (which could range between 0-1) was categorized as low (below .33), medium (between .33 and .66), and high (above .66). Table 11 summarizes the results of this data analysis.

Table 11: Quality Rating of Staff in All Program Areas

Quality Rating	Staff Position: Supervisory	Teacher	Counselor	Aide/Tutor
Low	1 (.7)	3 (1.8)	0 (0.0)	5 (6.7)
Medium	46 (32.4)	65 (38.4)	12 (24.0)	29 (39.2)
High	95 (66.9)	101 (59.8)	38 (76.0)	40 (54.1)
TOTAL	142 (100%)	169 (100%)	50 (100%)	74 (100%)

A further breakdown of this data, according to program area, did not reveal any significant change in the overall pattern. (See Appendix C, Table 12) It is quite apparent that half to three-quarters of the staff, in all positions, had a high quality rating. Very few staff had a low quality rating -- only the aide/tutor position had a slightly higher percentage who were rated as low quality.

4.3.2 Intensity of Treatment

The intensity of treatment was determined by asking the project directors to indicate the duration of training for the target population in terms of months, days, and hours. This data is reported separately for each of the three fiscal years. Table 13 summarizes this data.

Table 13: Intensity of Treatment for All Program Areas

Duration of Treatment	Mean	Range
1979-80		
# of months	8.9	2-12 months
# of days/month	15.4	1-22 days
# of hours/day	2.9	1-8 hours
1980-81		
# of months	8.6	1-12 months
# of days/month	15.8	1-22 days
# of hours/day	3.1	1-8 hours
1981-82		
# of months	8.8	1-12 months
# of days/month	16.6	2-22 days
# of hours/day	3.2	1-8 hours

Over the three years there is not any significant change in the duration of treatment, although there was an indication of a slight increase over the three years in both the average number of days/month and number of hours/day in which the target population was involved in these programs. These data can also be used to estimate the average number of hours members of the target group participated in these programs for the disadvantaged; this estimate is 432 hours/year (usually a 9-month program). This average is just less than half of what would be considered the average number of classroom hours in a regular 9-month school program.

4.3.3 Focus of Programmatic Effort

The focus of the federally funded programs for the disadvantaged can, in a very general sense, be partially determined by the number of projects funded in each program area. The analysis of the background data provided the results of our data regarding this. A list of program areas indicating the greatest to the least number of programs funded would result in: secondary, postsecondary, guidance, special programs, limited-English speaking, and teacher education. However, close to three-quarters of all programs funded came under the secondary category which shows that the emphasis is on specific programs for students in the secondary schools who are disadvantaged.

To further address the focus of programmatic effort, it is also important to examine the needs of the disadvantaged population which these programs were designed to meet. Over 81 percent of the project directors indicated a needs assessment was conducted to determine the vocational needs of the target population. These needs assessments varied from very formal to informal data collection procedures. Table 14 identifies the variety of procedures used and the number of programs using these various procedures.

Table 14: Procedures Used to Determine Needs of Target Population

Procedures used to determine need	# Programs indicating use
Survey, assessment, and/or review of student progress, test scores (i.e,, standarized, achievement), etc.	95
Job Placement Data/Community unemployment rate/Other employment, labor market data	28
Teacher recommendations from surveys, interviews, etc.	24
Counselor evaluations/surveys/ recommendations, etc.	23
Study of drop-out and/or attrition rate	17
Advisory Committee Recommendations (i.e., citizen, parents, etc.)	14
Need was determined informally/ Other ways	11
Student Survey/Student Interest, etc.	11
Student Attendance and/or discipline problems	10
Student Personal Data, including family income, public assistance, free or reduced lunches, etc.	10
Administrative assessment	7
Evaluation of existing curriculum	6
Survey or study performed by a third party; for example, a private business	3

The project director was also asked to identify these needs in an open-ended question; a post-coding of these responses resulted in the following as presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Needs of Disadvantaged Population Addressed by All Program Areas

NEEDS	# PROGRAMS (%)
To improve basic academic skills	122 (51.9)
To develop job related skills or improve knowledge of vocational careers	126 (53.6)
To improve self-concept, motivation	25 (10.6)
To reduce drop-out rate	19 (8.1)
To increase ability to achieve success in regular classroom	24 (10.2)
To improve language proficiency	10 (4.3)

It is important to understand that there could be multiple needs addressed by a program, therefore, the results in Table 15 do not total 100 percent. Furthermore, since the question was open-ended, there may have been secondary needs addressed in the programs, but not explicitly mentioned by the program directors. By far, though, the two primary areas of focus were on the development of academic skills and job related skills. An examination of this data according to program area only reveals the expected differences -- e.g., limited-English speaking programs focus on improving language proficiency, guidance programs focus on improving knowledge of vocational careers and improving self-concept/motivation, and so on.

4.3.4 Clarity of Program Plan

The clarity of a program plan can be examined on two levels. One, at the state level, is related to the usefulness of the Vocational Education Guidelines for the Application of Federal Funds and the helpfulness of the Vocational Field Consultants. A second, at the program level, is related to the program proposal and whether or not modifications needed to be made during the implementation stage.

Overwhelmingly, the project directors responded favorably with regard to the usefulness of the guidelines (93.4%) and helpfulness of the field consultants (99.1%). Of the 15 project directors who indicated that the guidelines did not meet their information needs the following reasons were given:

- Guidelines are too disorganized, complicated, vague, unclear, difficult to follow (8 responses).
- Guidelines were written for application to secondary schools, not easily applicable to the operation of other (i.e., post secondary) education programs (5 responses).
- Questions seem inappropriate, awkwardly stated (1 response).
- Time lines are not adequate (1 response).

Only three project directors responded negatively when asked about the field consultants; their responses were:

- Did not avail themselves -- no input was offered from anyone outside of the highschool.
- They were not involved in providing assistance at that time.
- The Director never received personal interaction or help from a field consultant.

The number of negative responses to these questions is really insignificant and would seem to indicate an overall satisfaction with the guidelines and consultants provided by the Bureau of Vocational Education. However, there was a consistent comment made by the staff of programs which were visited. Staff from six out of ten programs visited indicated they had very limited contact with BVE and although they had no problems, they felt that their programs could be more effectively designed and implemented if BVE monitored and evaluated their programs more consistently. One program director also indicated a desire: 1) to have information provided by BVE on model programs and 2) to develop a network with other programs throughout the state. The program director indicated such information would help them to design their programs and not make the mistakes already made in the past. In other words, they don't want to reinvent the wheel if it's already been done, they just want to use it to their benefit.

At the program level, 82 percent of the program directors indicated their proposal was implemented as stated. Only 1.7 percent of the proposals (4 in total) were implemented with major modifications. These major modifications included: major curriculum changes; major equipment changes (purchase instead of lease); time line change (from two semesters to one), change in targeted disadvantaged population (four grade levels instead of two); and change in project staffing. The minor modifications made in 16.4 percent (38, in total) of the programs included: minor

curriculum changes; changes in predicted staff need and/or staff duties; change in target population (more/less students served than projected, disadvantaged determined differently than proposed); budget revisions; change in instructional equipment, materials, etc.; change in proposed in-house training procedures; changes in time line.

When the project directors were asked if the awarding of their contract from PDE coincided with the proposed start-up date of their project, an average of 15 percent (over the three years) indicated "no." This, no doubt, would create problems in implementation.

4.3.5 Link Between Program Objectives and Procedures

The program directors were asked to indicate in an open-ended question, the objectives of their program and the procedures used to achieve these objectives. Since the responses to these questions were on a limited basis, it is extremely difficult to determine the extent to which the necessary links were present. A qualitative analysis of this limited data did indicate a consistency between objectives and procedures. However, most of the objectives outlined by the programs were what should be termed the "mediating process" between the Pennsylvania funded activities and the intended impact of the programs on the state level as embedded in the State Goals and Subgoals. Thus, one subgoal is "to provide remedial and supportive services to place disadvantaged students in vocational education programs." Individual programs whose objectives were to increase

basic math and reading skills through the use of diagnosis, individualized instruction, and tutoring, hence provided that mediating process whereby the state goal could be achieved. Individual programs did maintain limited evidence regarding their own performance, i.e., that the program was provided to so many students, that the change in their basic skills was so much, etc. However, there was little evidence to indicate the extent to which their program helped achieve the state goal of placing disadvantaged students in vocational education programs.

4.3.6 Staff Commitment

To determine staff commitment the project directors were asked to assess the overall motivation and dedication of staff who worked for the program. The results of this question showed a high level of motivation as perceived/reported by the project director. Thirty-seven (37) percent were extremely motivated, 50 percent were highly motivated and 10.5 percent were somewhat motivated. No project director reported a lack of motivation among staff and only 2.2 percent indicated they were unable to make a judgement. In examining this variable by program area, the only striking difference is that the secondary and limited-English speaking programs had fewer of their staff rated as extremely motivated than the other program areas. (See Appendix C, Table 16.)

In addition to this subjective assessment by the project directors, the rate of turnover and absenteeism can be used as an indication of staff commitment. These variables were incorporated into the quality

rating of staff and therefore are not available separately. However, it is known that staff turnover and absenteeism did not appear to be beyond what would be expected as normal.

4.3.7 Supervisory Plan

The extent to which there was a well specified supervisory mechanism was assessed by determining:

- if there were specific in-house training procedures for the project
- if there was a formal evaluation of staff activities.

The project directors indicated that in only 64 percent of the programs there were in-house training procedures. For the most part, these procedures included regular staff conferences, workshops/seminars, training by other professional staff members, courses and self-instruction. Thirty-six (36) percent of the programs, however, did not have any training. Project directors indicated, most frequently, that project staff were already competent in the area. Therefore, in-house training procedures were unnecessary.

A formal procedure for evaluation of staff activities was used in 80.8 percent of the programs. Procedures employed, as indicated by the project director included: traditional school system evaluation, teacher evaluation from observation, evaluation by Project Director, student progress, BVE/CETA/PDE monitoring, group evaluation, advisory committee, DEBE, annual accountability report, and third party. Of the 19.2 percent

who indicated there was no formal staff evaluation, most indicated the reason to be that it was done informally, it was not necessary, or there was not enough time.

Only in one instance was there a change in this pattern of the data when examined for the different program areas. Guidance programs were twice as likely not to have in-house training procedures whereas this was reversed for the other program areas.

4.3.8 Documentation of Service Delivery

Whether or not appropriate records and documents were maintained was determined by asking if attendance records were maintained and what records and documents were kept that documented service delivery. For all three fiscal years, over 95 percent of the project directors reported maintaining attendance records. Eighty-seven (87) percent also indicated they had documents and records regarding their service delivery. These documents and records included such items as outlined in Table 17.

Table 17: Type of Records Documenting Service Delivery

Type of Document/Record	#Programs Indicating Use
Student Progress reports	116
Attendance Records	109
Classroom records/counselor's, teacher's, tutor's or instructor's planning and/or record book/anecdotal notes	45
Traditional institutional records/end of year reports (including accountability reports, VEMIS, etc.)/Evaluation of program by administration	40
Pre and/or Post Test data/Selection test data (i.e., standarized testing scores, etc.)	32
Employment and/or placement records, evaluation	15
Evlauation of program by teachers, students etc.	11
Number of students who completed the program and/or graduated	7
Evaluation by a third-party (outside of the school system).	2

There was very little difference among the program areas as it relates to the records and documents maintained.

4.4 IMPACT/OUTCOME ASSESSMENT

As discussed earlier, impact questions were dealt with at two levels of analysis. First, individual programs had to identify any evidence which was used to evaluate their success in achieving their own specific objectives as outlined in their program proposal; secondly, the programs had to provide any evidence which might have been maintained that evaluated their success in achieving what might be considered more general objectives, statewide.

Project directors were first asked if a formal procedure for evaluating project success was employed. Only 68.5 percent of the programs did employ what they considered a formal evaluation procedure. The type of data gathered is reported in Table 18.

Table 18: Type of Evaluative Data Gathered

Type of Data	# Programs Indicating Use
Grades/Test Scores	96
Teacher subjective evaluations	92
Counselor Assessment	58
Discipline	15
Attendance	15
Other	67

In most cases, the standard procedure for evaluating classroom success was used -- grades, tests and teacher evaluations. When asked more specifically what kinds of data were maintained to document the accomplishment of the program's objectives the project directors indicated the items found in Table 19.

Both Tables 18 and 19 make it clear that the bulk of what was gathered as evaluative data and indicators of success can be considered measures of immediate (short-term, direct) outcome of the program. For example, participants attended and completed the program, earned a passing grade, and became competent in a specific skill area. Very few programs gathered data on what might be considered long-term (indirect) effects of program involvement -- e.g., being mainstreamed, getting a job, improving self-esteem, job performance, and employer satisfaction.

The project directors were also asked to indicate impact data which they maintained pertaining to more general objectives of vocational education for the disadvantaged on a statewide level. Each question asked the project director to provide data concerning the proportion of students in their program who achieved the designated expected outcome. Table 20 presents the results of this data analysis. It should be noted that many programs may not have collected the data or it was not applicable to thier type of program. The percentage of respondents for those two missing data possibilities is also specified in the table.

Table 19: Types of Evidence Documenting Accomplishment of Program Objectives

Evidence	# Programs Indicating Use
Annual accountability, VEMIS, Final and/or year end reports.	49
Classroom records including counselor, tutor, teacher evaluations from observation; student's grades, performance or progress records, attendance, etc.	27
School records including attendance and discipline records, student transcripts.	24
Pre and Post test scores/comparison reports of students served vs. students not served	21
Employer evaluation and/or job placement data after compeltion of program and/or graduation	18
Statistics or records of student drop-out/ retention rate	18
Subjective evaluation statements by students (i.e., participants)/student surveys/follow-up data	10
Other (career choice, longitudinal study of each student served, individual evaluation reports, teachers knowledge of students who obtained jobs, change in curriculum, monthly newsletters, advisory committee minutes, pictures of student working on projects)	9
Student records indicating completion of program/ program completers	8
Student graduation with diploma or equivalent	7
School evaluations by administration, staff, advisory committees, etc.	6
Number of students mainstreamed	5
Specific type of evidence not identified	4
Enrollment in postsecondary and/or continuing education programs after completion/graduation from program	3

TABLE 20: REPORTED RATES OF SUCCESS ON EXPECTED OUTCOMES

RATE OF SUCCESS	EXPECTED OUTCOMES: STDNTS MAINSTRMD	STDNTS GRAD WITH H.S. DIPLOMA	ACQUIRED EXPECTED ACAD. SKILLS	EMPLOYED IN TRNG RE-JOBS	EMPLOYED IN ACCEPT JOBS	ENHNCED SELF-IMAGE CONF.	STDNTS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED PROGRAM
0-25%	10 (4.5)	3 (1.4)	2 (.9)	8 (3.6)	3 (1.3)	———	———
26-50%	8 (3.6)	5 (2.3)	15 (6.8)	20 (9.0)	7 (3.2)	7 (3.1)	4 (1.9)
51-75%	8 (3.6)	10 (4.5)	34 (15.5)	12 (5.4)	7 (3.2)	18 (8.1)	28 (13.0)
76-90%	5 (2.3)	19 (8.5)	39 (17.7)	4 (1.8)	7 (3.2)	33 (14.8)	41 (19.1)
over 90%	58 (26.1)	86 (38.7)	41 (18.6)	3 (1.3)	9 (4.0)	45 (20.2)	93 (43.3)
Not Applicable	107 (48.2)	46 (20.7)	35 (15.9)	43 (19.3)	42 (18.9)	18 (8.1)	13 (6.0)
Data Not Available	26 (11.7)	53 (23.9)	54 (24.6)	133 (59.6)	147 (66.2)	102 (45.7)	36 (16.7)
TOTAL	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)	(100%)

These data reveal that the expected outcomes most likely to be reported dealt with: 1) acquiring the expected academic skills and 2) graduation with high school diploma. The expected outcomes least likely to be reported dealt with employment after program completion. Overall, these data do show a moderate to high amount of success in the reported areas. However, it must be kept in mind that the figures, more often than not, are estimates provided by the project directors and not always based on objective data maintained in their files. Because of this, it is normal to expect inflated figures as responses to these questions.

Although no programs reported they gathered data from students regarding their satisfaction with the program, the project directors were asked to indicate how they thought the target population would evaluate aspects of the program. Table 21 shows the results of this question.

Table 21: Student Satisfaction with the Program as Perceived by Project Director

Aspects of the Program	Level of Satisfaction VS	S	N	D	VD	Cannot Say	Total Percent
Staff Qualifications	124 (55.6)	88 (39.5)	8 (3.6)	—	—	3 (1.3)	223 (100%)
Staff Help/Support	117 (53.4)	95 (43.4)	5 (2.3)	—	—	2 (.9)	219 (100%)
Materials Used	98 (44.1)	111 (50.0)	9 (4.1)	2 (.9)	—	2 (.9)	222 (100%)
Services Provided	107 (48.2)	108 (48.6)	4 (1.8)	1 (.5)	—	2 (.9)	222 (100%)
Overall Satisfaction with Project	107 (48.6)	109 (49.5)	2 (.9)	1 (.5)	—	1 (.5)	220 (100%)

* VS = very satisfied
S = satisfied
N = Neutral
D = Disatisfied
VD = Very Disatisfied

As with the other outcome data, there appears to be a high level of satisfaction within the target population -- but, again, it must be remembered that these figures are based on estimates and probably are inflated.

During the site visits students were also questioned regarding their satisfaction with the program currently in operation. Although these students were not the same students involved in the program during the fiscal years

under investigation, their input is useful as an evaluation of how the program is presently being operated. Table 22 gives the results of the short student satisfaction survey. (See Appendix B, Interview Schedule, pg. 17 for a copy of this survey.)

Table 22: Student Satisfaction with Current Programs

Aspect of Program	Level of Satisfaction VS	S	N	D	VD	Cannot Say	Total Percent
Staff Qualifications	24 (47.0)	19 (37.3)	6 (11.8)	—	—	2 (3.9)	51 (100%)
Staff Help/Support	20 (39.2)	25 (49.0)	4 (7.9)	—	—	2 (3.9)	51 (100%)
Materials Used	15 (29.4)	28 (54.9)	3 (5.9)	3 (5.9)	—	2 (3.9)	51 (100%)
Services Provided	16 (32.7)	19 (38.8)	9 (18.4)	4 (8.1)	—	1 (2.0)	49 (100%)
Overall Satisfaction with Program	19 (38.0)	21 (42.0)	9 (18.0)	1 (2.0)	—	—	50 (100%)

* VS = very satisfied N = neutral VD = very disatisfied
S = satisfied D = disatisfied

These data are important since they do not contradict the perceptions of the project directors; in both measurements there is a high level of student satisfaction.

The impact of these programs can also be viewed in a manner devoid of any specific outcomes within the target populations. The impact issue addressed here deals with the vocational education system (for the disadvantaged). It is important to know whether or not changes have come about within the local education agencies as a result of the federal funds provided for developing programs geared to the disadvantaged.

Initially, the project director was asked if the staff's attitude toward the disadvantaged changed over the course of the program. A majority (55.1 percent) of the directors indicated there was a change of the staff's attitudes in a positive direction. Only 1.4 percent indicated a change in a negative direction. The remainder indicated no change in attitudes.

Secondly, project directors were asked if any significant changes in their school system resulted from the development and implementation of their program for the disadvantaged. Two-thirds (65.9 percent) indicated a change had occurred. Table 23 outlines the types of changes specified by these directors.

Table 23: Types of Changes within School System

	# Programs Indicating Change
More disadvantaged students are succeeding in school because of program participation and/or completion. Also, more students are improving the required remedial and/or academic skills.	30
The school system, including the administration, teaching staff, etc. has acquired a better understanding of the need for a total educational program and is more sensitive and/or aware, to the special needs of the disadvantaged.	20
More disadvantaged students are given the opportunity to graduate - or are graduating - with job entry skills and are better prepared for the world of work. Project has resulted in meeting career objectives of disadvantaged students.	19
The school system, district, etc, has taken steps to increase its contribution and/or commitment to maintain and/or expand the program, with or without funding.	19
Project has become an established part of the regular educational curriculum.	11
More disadvantaged students are showing an interest in specific vocational programs via increased enrollment rates	9
Project resulted in a reduction of the student drop-out rate	8
Program has been cut or become smaller due to budget considerations	4
Community relationships have improved as a result of better serving disadvantaged students	3

These data reveal, at the most, only 8 percent of the programs had significant and lasting changes within their system. An inference from this is that most programs that are functioning do so only because of the federal monies provided to run these programs. If this funding was stopped, it is likely the specialized needs of the disadvantaged would not be met.

The site visits were also used to gather direct input from the project directors and staff regarding the state system of vocational education for the disadvantaged. The program directors and staff were asked if there was a continuing need for their program and if so, how would it be funded. All 10 of the programs indicated a continuing need; five said supplemental funding was needed; three indicated the program already switched to local funding; two said the program could continue without supplemental funds, but at a reduced level.

The project directors and staff were also asked to provide input regarding what Pennsylvania could do to improve the capacity of vocational education to meet the present and future needs of disadvantaged populations either with or without supplemental funding. There were a variety of responses from the staff of these programs; some of the most significant responses were:

- Programs have limited contact with BVE; BVE needs to be more available, provide consistent monitoring and on-site visits
- Networking among programs across the state needs to be established; models of effective programming should be made available to LEA's during their planning stages

- The uncertainty of funding from year to year and the lateness in which funding decisions are made leads to instability in the programs.

- There needs to be more staff stability in BVE, required paperwork needs to be more relevant; the state needs to provide more input regarding skills needed for jobs; program operators need to be involved in planning at the state level.

- The image of vocational education across the state needs to be improved; career education needs to be provided at earlier ages; motivational skills of students need to be improved; there is a concern about PDE's increase in graduation requirements in math and English - this puts a limit on vocational education; programs for the disadvantaged need to be more flexible.

- There is a need to train teachers for vocational education, also college and university level professors need training.

- More funding is needed, particularly for updating equipment.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data examined in the analysis section has provided the basis from which an evaluative judgement can be made regarding the implementation and impact of vocational education programs for disadvantaged populations in Pennsylvania.

The strength and integrity of the implementation of these programs across the state did not present any major problems. The quality of staff was moderately high and they had a high level of motivation; the intensity of treatment was adequate for the purpose at hand; the programs focused on a variety of needs within the target population, although the major focus was on improving academic skills and skill training; and adequate records were maintained by the programs to document service delivery. However, the training and supervision of the program staff, as a whole, could have followed more formalized procedures. The aspect of program implementation which caused the greatest difficulty is with regard to the link between program objectives and procedures. The problem, here, lies not in the individual programs and their specific objectives and procedures, but rather with the State Goals and Subgoals. These goals and subgoals in the estimation of this researcher, lack what is needed for strategic planning and an organizing focus. Take for example what has been said by John Naisbit in Megatrends (1984:98-99):

> A strategic vision is a clear image of what you want to achieve which then organizes and instructs every step toward that goal. The extraordinarily successful strategic vision for NASA was "Put a man on the moon by the end of the decade." That strategic vision gave magnetic direction to the entire organization. Nobody had to be told or reminded where the organization was going. Contrast the organizing focus of putting a man on the moon by the end of the decade with "We are going to be the world leader in space exploration," which doesn't organize anything.

The State Goals and Subgoals are not stated in measurable terms, nor is there a clear link between planned activities (fund expenditure) and the acheivement of the State Goals. Moreover, the intended social impact(s) are not clearly identified. Indeed, the vagueness of the existing State Goals and Subgoals is also reflected in the individual programs. In many instances their objectives and procedures were just as vague. Although, a trend that has been occurring is toward the establishment of quantifiable objectives on the local level. (Not all programs are doing this, however.) Unfortunately, what has happened is that now there is a collection of very diverse outcome measures, very few of which can be aggregated and apply to what might be considered impact measures on the state level. Also, it was noted that in many accountability reports, when asked to evaluate how their program met the State Goal and Subgoals, many responses were very general. There were statements such as: "The program expanded vocational education opportunities for academically disadvantaged students in that it provided remedial services which improved their ability to function in a regular

vocational educational program (Accountability Report, 1979). Such statements do not provide any evidence of accomplishment and therefore do not tell us much.

This problem of a lack of strategic vision also ties into the problems encountered in the assessment of impact data. Too many of the programs did not have a formalized evaluation procedure for their program. Moreover, in many of the programs that did have some data, much of it was based on estimates rather than empirical measurements. Because of this, it is very difficult to draw any conclusions regarding program outcomes and impact. However, the data that was provided by the project directors — as related to the short-term impacts of their program -- revealed a high degree of success in their programs. Moreover, the students satisfaction with the programs was high.

The extent to which the capacity of vocational education has improved was a final impact question addressed. Although the amount of funding over the years has provided the means to develop and implement vocational education programs for the disadvantaged, there was little evidence to indicate a significant, long-lasting change within the system. There is still a continuing need for the programs and many programs would be discontinued if supplemental funding were not available to them.

Based on the data analysis and the conclusions drawn from it, the following are recommendations made in this research:

RECOMMENDATION 1: There is a definite need to develop, within the State Plan, specific measurable objectives for disadvantaged populations in Pennsylvania. These objectives should correspond to the intended impact of these programs. Moreover, the procedures (planned activities) for achieving these objectives should be clearly delineated along with the rationale as to why these activities will accomplish what is intended.

It must be kept in mind that vocational education will not solve all the problems faced by the disadvantaged in our society. Nor can vocational education expect to be the only factor in eradicating the problems of the disadvantaged. However, vocational education which is designed to meet the educational needs of the disadvantaged, should have some short-term and long-term impact on them. (Keeping in mind that no one expects 100% success.) A very probable area of impact would be in the area of employment. Thus, one very specific objective of vocational education for the disadvantaged might be to provide the education and skills necessary for 75% of those completing training to find jobs in related areas (within six months after completing training). This objective can be directly measured and if it is not reached due to programming variables, then modifications in programming can be made in order to continuously work toward the accomplishment of this goal.

RECOMMENDATION 2: There should be an evaluation system implemented that provides 1) the data necessary to determine program impact on a state level as identified in the State Goals and Subgoals and 2) the data that can be used to determine and improve program quality.

There are definite movements in this direction - for example, VEMIS provides an information system whereby a statewide accounting of students served is made. This data is not all that is needed however, since it does very little to tell us about the quality of programming and its impact. VEMIS data only tells how many and what kinds of students actually received particular types of service. With regard to quality of programming, it is also necessary to gather data in addition to that which documents the number of students served and compliance type questions. Additional types of data needed would include information on planning and operational processes, short-term outcomes within the target population and long-term impact gathered through student follow-up studies.

Ideally, if BVE wants to determine the impact of these programs there should be a research design implemented that would allow for long-term (2-5 years) monitoring and evaluation of a program and its participants and the use of a control group for comparison. This, of course, would not be feasible for all programs throughout the state, but one model program selected in each program area would be adequate. This type of evaluation design would enable a researcher to gather follow-up data on

the participants in order to determine the impact of such programs on future employment, employer and employee satisfaction -- variables which are ultimately the long-term impacts intended in these programs.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Bureau of Vocational Education needs to maintain more contact with the funded programs. BVE also needs to provide more input and guidelines that would help LEA's design and implement needed and effective programs.

It is understood that staff cut-backs and increased responsibilities of remaining BVE staff make it extremely difficult to carry out recommendation 3. However, if more BVE staff were available, it is important to recognize the need for more input into the field. Statewide needs assessments of vocational skills needed in business and industry along with model programs for the disadvantaged (in many program areas) would be very beneficial to programs and enable them to provide the most up-to date training. Moreover, since many programs for the disadvantaged offer supportive services, it is also important that programs be kept aware of - on a regular basis through a formal networking system - the types of programs that have proven most effective when dealing with the disadvantaged.

RECOMMENDATION 4: There should be an effort made by BVE to improve the image of vocational education and more emphasis should be placed on funding or supporting career edcuation programs at an earlier age. Guidance counselors have to be more attuned to the needs of the disadvantaged and aware of the special opportunity that vocational education can offer to this target group.

Although there are no precise figures as to the actual size of the disadvantaged target population in Pennsylvania, it is probably accurate to state that the vocational education programs for the disadvantaged have not reached the entire population. There are two issues to address here: 1) are there enough programs to meet the needs of the entire group? or, 2) are the programs already offered not filled to capacity because students cannot (because of time) or will not take part in them? The answer to both these questions is probably "yes." No doubt, there are still many unmet needs because of limited funds. However, as pointed out in one of the site visits, they have had a very difficult time in encouraging the disadvantaged student to take part in their alternative business education program. Their problems stem from students' lack of desire, but also because there is not enough time in the day for some students to do this as well as fulfill other academic requirements. This points to the need for better outreach methods and guidance which will make disadvantaged students aware of the vocational education opportunities available to them and how this will make them more employable in the long run.

RECOMMENDATION 5: There should be a greater emphasis in BVE on teacher education for the disadvantaged learner.

The educational system in America has received a great deal of scrutiny and criticism in the past couple years. Part of the criticism has addressed the problems with teacher education - many of which do not need to be discussed here. However, teacher education as it relates to dealing with the

disadvantaged is an issue that needs discussed. Since the 1960s with the movement toward equal educational opportunities for all, the U.S. has seen a much higher percentage of disadvantaged students within the school systems and for longer periods of time; also there are greater numbers moving into postsecondary education. The schools are now faced with the problem of helping these disadvantaged students so they can get the most out of their educational experience. However, the teachers in these systems - who can be a critical element in the educational experience of a disadvantaged student - are not prepared to deal with the problems they face. Their efforts, if any exist at all, will end up being based on trial-and-error. There is a real need for teachers to understand, not only what the most appropriate teaching methodology is for these students, but also the social-emotional make-up of the disadvantaged learner. These disadvantaged students are the ones who need the best teachers; bright students will make it, regardless. Therefore, a lack of preparation on the part of the teachers is analogous to trying to build a house without first laying the foundation. If the vocational educational system, as it relates to the disadvantaged, is ever to improve its capacity to meet the needs of the disadvantaged, then there needs to be greater emphasis on teacher education. Moreover, all teachers need training that will enable them to deal with the disadvantaged learner - in their own classrooms. If this is accomplished then the need to segregate students in specialized programs will no longer be required. Segregation based on a "disadvantaged" criterion can

be very demoralizing and it ultimately leads to education of these students at only a minimum level of competence. In the long run, this is not fair to the disadvantaged because it does nothing to eliminate the perpetuation of a "disadvantaged" population within our society.

A final note should be made here: it is understood that efforts toward equal educational opportunities for all cannot be achieved overnight - or even within one decade. Moreover, Goal VIII of Pennsylvania's State Plan does correspond with the suggestion that the ultimate goal should be to have the disadvantaged student in regular vocational programs. It may just be that during this transition period, specialized programs are still needed.

6.0 DISSEMINATION

The results of this research were presented at the 1984 Pennsylvania Conference held in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Sunday, June 24, through Wednesday, June 27, 1984.

The final report was submitted to the Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education of the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Also, a copy of the final report was forwarded to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education in accordance with guidelines of the Education Act 1976 (Public Law 94-482).

7.0 REFERENCES

Cloward, Richard A., and Jones, James A. "Social Class Educational Attitudes and Participation." Education in Depressed Areas. Passow, A. Harry (ed.) (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University) 1963, pp. 190-216.

Coles, Robert. "Some Children the Schools Have Never Served." Saturday Review. June 18, 1966, pp. 58-60.

Federal Register. "Vocational Education, State Programs and Commissioner's Discretionary Programs." Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, October 3, 1977.

Fourteenth Annual Evaluation Report, Pennsylvania Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1983.

Glittles, Joseph B. Understanding Minority Groups. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Science Editions) 1964.

Havighurst, Robert J. "Who Are the Socially Disadvantaged?" Journal of Negro Education. Vol. 34, Fall, 1965, pp. 39-46.

Howard, Lawrence C. "Teach Them the Arts of Freedom." Saturday Review. June 18, 1966, pp. 66-67, 79-80.

Naisbit, John. Megatrends. (New York: Warner Books) 1984.

Request for Proposal (RFP). "Assessment of the Impact of the Bureau of Vocational Education's Program for Disadvantaged Populations in Pennsylvania." The Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Education, 1983.

Resurge '79: Manual for Identifying Classifying and Serving the Disadvantaged and Handicapped under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1979.

Riessman, Frank. "The Overlooked Positives of Disadvantaged Groups." Journal of Negro Education. Vol. 34, No. 2, Spring, 1965, pp. 160-166.

Riessman, Frank. Culturally Deprived Child. (New York: Harper and Brothers) 1962.

Schneider, Anne L. "Studying Policy Implementation: A Conceptual Framework." Evaluation Review. Volume 6, No. 6. 1982.

Spears, Harold, and Pivnick, Isadore. "How an Urban School System Identifies It's Disadvantaged." The Journal of Negro Education. Vol. 33, 1964, p. 232.

State Goals and Subgoals for Vocational Education in Pennsylvania, Five Year Plan for Vocational Education, FY78-82, Bureau of Vocational Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1977.

Summary of 1979-80 Disadvantaged Proposals, Summary of 1980-81 Disadvantaged Proposal, and Summary of 1981-82 Disadvantaged Proposals. Bureau of Vocational Education, Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1980, 1981, 1982.

Yeaton, William H. and Robin Redner. "Measuring Strength and Integrity of Treatments: Rationale, Techniques, and Examples." In R.F. Conner, Methodological Advances in Evaluation Research. (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications) 1981.

APPENDIX A: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATION IN PENNSYLVANIA
PROJECT DIRECTOR'S SURVEY

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1) Title of Program:

2) Location of Project Operation: _____

3) Person completing the questionnaire: _____

Were you the Project Director/Coordinator/Supervisor ____ Yes ____ No

If no, what was your position in relation to the project? _____

4) Telephone Number: _____ Best Time To Reach You, if we have any questions _____

5) Fiscal years for which this program received funding and corresponding contract number.

Fiscal Year	Contract No.
____ 1979-80	_____
____ 1980-81	_____
____ 1981-82	_____

6) Specify the amount of funds received for this project. (Specify for each fiscal year funding was received)

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Federal Funds	_____	_____	_____
Non-Federal Funds	_____	_____	_____
Total Amount of Project Funds	_____	_____	_____

7) Were all the funds received for this project used? (Answer separately for each fiscal year funding was received)

1979-80

____ Yes

____ No; if no why? _____

1980-81

____ Yes

____ No; if no, why? _____

1981-82

____ Yes

____ No; if no, why? _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. PROJECT'S TARGET POPULATION

1) What was the target population for the project? (Mark all that apply)

____ Academically disadvantaged

____ Economically disadvantaged

____ Limited-English speaking

2) How was disadvantagment of students determined? (Mark all that apply)

____ math scores

____ reading scores

____ writing skills

____ performance below grade level

____ preference for language other than English

____ family income at or below poverty levle

____ participant/parent/guardian unemployed

____ participant/parent/guardian recipient of public assistance

____ participant institutionalized or under state guardianship

____ other, please specify _____

3) What was the student enrollment for this project? (Specify for each fiscal year your project received funding)

	1979-80		1980-81		1981-82	
	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
Males	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Females	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

4) What was the duration of training for the target population? (Specify for each fiscal year your project received funding. For example, you might indicate the training period was for 9 months, 5 days per week, 2 hours per day. If you had an open entry-exist type program, please estimate the average duration of training and indicate that it is an average.

1979-80

# of months _____

# of days/month _____

# of hours/day _____

Were attendance records maintained? ____Yes ____No

1980-81

# of months _____

# of days/month _____

# of hours/day _____

Were attendance records maintained? ____Yes ____No

1981-82

# of months _____

# of days/month _____

# of hours/day _____

Were attendance records maintained? ____Yes ____No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. PROJECT STAFFING

1) Indicate the total number of project staff for your project. Include the Project Director/Project Coordinator/Project Supervisor in your totals. (Specify for each fiscal year your project received funding)

[1979-80] Total number of project staff ___ ; Number full-time ___ ; Number part-time ____

[1980-81] Total number of project staff ___ ; Number full-time ___ ; Number part-time ____

[1981-82] Total number of project staff ___ ; Number full-time ___ ; Number part-time ____

2) Were there specific inhouse staff training procedures employed for this project?

____ Yes; If yes, specify: _____

_____

_____

____ No; If no, why? _____

_____

_____

3) Was there a formal procedure for evaluation of staff activities?

____ Yes; If yes, what procedure was used? _____

_____

____ No; If no, why not? _____

_____

4) If you were to rate the overall motivation and dedication of staff who worked for this project would you say they were:

____ extremely motivated

____ highly motivated

____ somewhat motivated

____ not motivated very much

____ not at all motivated

____ unable to make judgement

5) Did the project staff's attitudes toward disadvantaged populations change over the course of the project? Explain

_____

_____

6) Specify the following information about project staff who had major responsibilities in the program (e.g., project director/coordinator/supervisor, teachers, aides or others working directly with the target population). Use the following chart to complete this information; xerox and attach additional sheets if needed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHART OF PROJECT STAFF (refer to question 6)

Fiscal Year	Position/Title	Educational Background	No. of Years as Professional Educator	No. of Years working on this Project	No. of Years of Experience with Disadvantaged Pop.	No. of Special Training Programs attended related to Project's focus # courses # workshops	No. of Days Absent throughout duration of Project

IV. PROJECT'S PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION

1) Was a needs assessment conducted to determine the vocational education needs of the target population?

____ Yes; If yes, specify the procedure employed to determine these needs (Attach a copy of the study results, if available).

_____

_____

_____

____ No

2) What basic need(s) of the disadvantaged population has this program been designed to meet?

_____

_____

_____

3) What was the purpose of your project? (If more space is needed, please use a separate sheet and attach)

_____

_____

_____

4) What were the specified procedures to be employed to achieve the purpose? (If more space is needed, please use a separate sheet and attach)

_____

_____

_____

5) To what extent was your project proposal implemented as stated.

____ implemented without modifications

____ implemented with the following minor modifications; Please specify _____

_____

____ implemented with the following major modifications; Please specify _____

_____

6) If either major or minor modifications were made during the implementation of your project, please indicate why it was necessary to modify your project from what was originally planned during the proposal stage.

_____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT'S PROPOSAL AND IMPLEMENTATION (CONTINUED)

7) Was the Bureau of Vocational Education notified of these changes?

____ Yes

____ No, If no, why? _____

_____

8) Did the awarding of your contract from PDE coincide with the proposed start up date of your project? (Specify for each fiscal year your project received funding)

1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
____Yes	____Yes	____Yes
____No	____No	____No

9) Do you feel that the Vocational Education Guidelines for the Application of Federal Funds meets your information needs for preparing a proposal?

____ Yes

____ No, If no, why? _____

_____

_____

Indicate which year's guidelines were used? _____

10) Do you feel the Bureau of Vocational Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education or the Vocational Field Consultants were helpful in answering any questions you had regarding your project -- either during the proposal or implementation stage?

____ Yes

____ No, If no, what problems did you encounter?

_____

_____

_____

_____

11) Do you have evidence documenting your project's service delivery (e.g., attendance records, completed assignments, progress reports, etc.)?

____ Yes

____ No

If yes, what documented evidence do you have?

_____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

V. PROJECT'S EVALUATION

1) Was there a formal procedure for evaluating the project's success?

____ Yes

____ No, if no, why? (go to question 4) _____

2) For each group providing evaluative data on the project, indicate the type of data gathered (e.g., attitudinal or behavioral) and the method for collecting the data (eig., survey instrument, interview, tests, other).

	Type of Data	Method of Collecting Data
Teachers		
Administrators		
Counselors		
Parents		
Target Groups		
Community Leaders/Advisory Groups		

3) Were pre and post measures part of the project's evaluative design?

____ Yes

____ No

4) If the target population were asked to evaluate their satisfaction with aspects of the project, how do you think they would evaluate the following: (Circle One)

	very satisfied	satisfied	neutral	dissatisfied	very dissatisfied	cannot say
Staff qualifications	1	2	3	4	5	6
Staff help/support	1	2	3	4	5	6
Materials used	1	2	3	4	5	6
Services provided	1	2	3	4	5	6
Overall satisfaction with project	1	2	3	4	5	6

5) Do you have evidence documentating the degree of accomplishment of your project's objectives?

____ Yes

____ No

If yes, what evidence do you have? (If a final report is available which provides this documentation, please attach a copy of this report with your completed questionnaire)

_____

_____

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT'S EVALUATION (CONTINUED)

6) Has this project resulted in any significant changes in your school system?

____ Yes, If yes, specify change _____

_____

____ No

7) What changes in the target population incurred as a result of this project?

_____

_____

_____

8) Listed below are a number of expected outcomes of vocational education programs for the disadvantaged. Please answer the outcome questions that are applicable to your type of program. If an outcome question is not applicable or there is no data available, please indicate this.

a. What proportion of students were mainstreamed following program completion?

_____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

b. What proportion of students graduated with a high school diploma following program completion? _____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

c. What proportion of students acquired the expected academic skills following program completion? _____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

d. What proportion of students are employed in training-related jobs six months following program completion? _____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

e. What proportion of students are employed in jobs they consider acceptable, whether in training-related fields or not, within six months following program completion? _____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

f. What proportion of students have an enhanced self-image and self-confidence following program completion? _____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

g. What proportion of students successfully completed your program? _____

____ not applicable

____ data not available

What criteria were used to judge success? _____

_____

_____

_____

THANK-YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: _____

_____

CONTRACT NUMBERS: _____

FISCAL YEAR(S): _____

CONTACT PERSON: _____

LOCATION: _____

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: _____

PROJECT DIRECTOR/COORDINATOR/SUPERVISOR

(Interviewer: Specify name and title of all persons interviewed)

Name/Title: _____

_____

History of Program:

- How long has program been in effect?

- Did you receive federal funds from PDE/BVE prior to and/or after the above specified fiscal years? If this program has not always had supplemental funding from BVE, what has the source of funds been?

- For what purpose was this program designed; to meet what needs of disadvantaged students? (Interviewer: have the director elaborate on the purpose, goals and procedures of the program and determine extent to which director presents a coherent description of the program.)

- Were there implementation problems encountered? If so, what were they and how were they resolved?

- Are there ways you think the program could be improved, if so how?

- Do you feel there is a continuing need for your program? If this program did not receive the supplemental funding from BVE, would the program continue? If yes, why? How would it be funded? If no, why not? (Interviewer: try to determine if the school's system has been changed so that they are now cognizant of the needs of disadvantaged students and would continue to meet these needs if supplemental funding was discontinued.)

- In general how can vocational education for the disadvantaged be improved? What can Pennsylvania do to improve the <u>capacity</u> of vocational education to meet the needs of present and future disadvantaged populations either with or without supplemental funding?

- What has your working relationship with the Bureau of Vocational Education been like? Are there ways to improve the operation of BVE that would enable you to more effectively design and implement your vocational education programs for the disadvantaged?

Review of Project's Records/Documents

- Interviewer: Are their records complete and maintained properly? Identify what records were examined and your evaluation of their quality. Type of records to look for: attendance, enrollment form per student or one enrollment sheet; student files -- grade, progress reports. Counselor assessments, completion form; final accountability report. (Rate from 1 to 10, 10 = highest.)

Records/Documents continued

- Interviewer: What, if any, documented evidence do they have regarding the success of program? What is the quality of this evidence?

Clarification of Data on Project Director's Survey

Other Topic Areas Discussed

PROJECT STAFF

(Interviewer: Specify name and title of all persons interviewed)

Name/Title: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Perception of Program

- How do you perceive the program and its goals, procedures used and outcomes? What is/was your responsibility in the program? (Interviewer: are the staff able to clearly articulate the purpose of the program and its operation? Do they appear to be competent for their assigned tasks?)

Assessment of Program's Operation

- How would you evaluate the operation of the program? Were there problems encountered; if so, how were they resolved?

- Was (is) the program successful in meeting the needs of disadvantaged students? If yes, how do you know this? (Interviewer: determine what evidence they have to substantiate their claim.)

- Do you feel there is a continuing need for your program? If the program did not receive supplemental funding from the BVE, do you think the program would continue? Why yes? Why no?

- Can you identify ways to improve your programming? If so, how?

- In general, how can vocational education for the disadvantaged be improved? What can Pennsylvania do to improve the capacity of vocational education to meet the needs of present and future disadvantaged populations either with or without supplemental funding? Are there ways to improve the operation of BVE that would enable you to more effectively design and implement your vocational education programs for the disadvantaged?

Other Comments/Areas of Discussion

STUDENTS

(Interviewer: Specify the number of students interviewed and whether they were involved in the program during the fiscal years specified)

Students: _____

_____

FY's involved: _____

Perception of Project

- Interviewer: Have students complete the brief evaluation form. (Provide explanations of evaluation questions, if necessary.)

- Interviewer: Ask the students to comment of what they think involvement in the project did for them. Determine the degree of enthusiasm among students, and if they got out of the project what was intended by the project designers.

- Interviewer: Determine if the students are aware of the purpose of the program in which they were involved.

- Ask the students if they can identify ways to improve the project.

Other Comments/Areas of Discussion

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Name of Project: _____

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of the project.

1 = very satisfied
2 = satisfied
3 = neutral
4 = dissatisfied
5 = very dissatisfied
6 = cannot say

Staff Qualifications	1	2	3	4	5	6
Staff help/support	1	2	3	4	5	6
Materials/equipment used	1	2	3	4	5	6
Other services provided	1	2	3	4	5	6
Overall satisfaction with project	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX C: TABLES

TABLE 3: FISCAL YEAR(S) FUNDED BY PROGRAM AREA

FISCAL YEAR(S)	PROGRAM AREA					
	LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING	SECONDARY	POST SECONDARY	GUIDANCE	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	TEACHER EDUCATION
1979-1980	———	27 (15.6)	6 (28.5)	9 (52.9)	7 (53.8)	———
1980-81	———	7 (4.1)	———	1 (5.9)	———	———
1981-82	4 (40.0)	21 (12.1)	4 (19.1)	1 (5.9)	———	1 (50.0)
1979-80 1980-81	1 (10.0)	14 (8.1)	5 (23.8)	5 (29.4)	1 (7.7)	———
1980-81 1981-82	3 (30.0)	23 (13.3)	2 (9.5)	———	3 (23.1)	1 (50.0)
1979-80 1980-81 1981-82	2 (20.0)	81 (46.8)	4 (19.1)	1 (5.9)	2 (15.4)	———
TOTAL	10 (100%)	173 (100%)	21 (100%)	17 (100%)	13 (100%)	2 (100%)

TABLE 5: TOTAL AMOUNT OF PROJECT FUNDS FOR 1979-80 by program area.

Total Amount of project funds for 1979-80	PROGRAM AREA*				
	LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING	SECONDARY	POST SECONDARY	GUIDANCE	SPECIAL PROGRAMS
Under $2,000	———	1 (.9)	———	———	———
$2,001 thru 10,000	———	17 (14.5)	———	1 (6.7)	———
$10,001 thru 20,000	2 (66.7)	28 (23.9)	1 (6.7)	2 (13.3)	———
$20,001 thru 40,000	———	41 (35.0)	1 (6.7)	4 (26.6)	2 (20.0)
$40,001 thru 60,000	———	12 (10.3)	4 (26.6)	3 (20.0)	2 (20.0)
$60,001 thru 80,000	1 (33.3)	5 (4.3)	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)	1 (10.0)
$80,001 thru 100,000	———	4 (3.4)	1 (6.7)	1 (6.7)	———
$100,001 thru 150,000	———	1 (.9)	3 (20.0)	1 (6.7)	2 (20.0)
OVER $150,000	———	8 (6.8)	3 (20.0)	2 (13.3)	3 (30.0)
TOTAL	3 (100%)	117 (100%)	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	10 (100%)

* No data were available for Teacher Education Programs

TABLE 6: Total Amount of Project Funds for 1980-81 by Program Area.

Total Amount of Project Funds for 1980-81	PROGRAM AREA*				
	LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING	SECONDARY	POST SECONDARY	GUIDANCE	SPECIAL PROGRAMS
Under $2,000	—	—	—	—	—
$2,001 thru 10,000	—	23 (19.2)	—	—	—
$10,001 thru 20,000	1 (16.7)	31 (25.8)	—	1 (14.3)	—
$20,001 thru 40,000	2 (33.3)	36 (30.0)	—	3 (42.9)	1 (16.7)
$40,001 thru 60,000	—	8 (6.7)	4 (36.4)	—	—
$60,001 thru 80,000	2 (33.3)	7 (5.8)	3 (27.3)	—	2 (33.3)
$80,001 thru 100,000	1 (16.7)	6 (5.0)	1 (9.0)	—	1 (16.7)
$100,001 thru 150,000	—	1 (.8)	3 (27.3)	2 (28.6)	—
Over $150,000	—	8 (6.7)	—	1 (14.3)	2 (33.3)
TOTAL	6 (100%)	120 (100%)	11 (100%)	7 (100%)	6 (100%)

* No data were available for Teacher Education Programs

TABLE 7: Total Amount of Project Funds for 1981-82 by Program Area.

Total Amount of Project Funds for 1981-82	PROGRAM AREAS*				
	LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING	SECONDARY	POST SECONDARY	GUIDANCE	SPECIAL PROGRAMS
Under $2,000	———	———	———	———	———
$2,001 thru 10,000	———	24 (19.9)	———	———	———
$10,001 thru 20,000	———	26 (21.5)	———	———	———
$20,001 thru 40,000	2 (25.0)	38 (31.4)	1 (10.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (20.0)
$40,001 thru 60,000	———	9 (7.4)	2 (20.0)	———	———
$60,001 thru 80,000	1 (12.5)	7 (5.8)	1 (10.0)	———	———
$80,001 thru 100,000	———	5 (4.1)	3 (30.0)	———	———
$100,001 thru 150,000	4 (50.0)	5 (4.1)	3 (30.0)	1 (50.0)	3 (60.0)
Over $150,000	1 (12.5)	7 (5.8)	———	———	1 (20.0)
TOTAL	8 (100%)	121 (100%)	10 (100%)	2 (100%)	5 (100%)

* No data were available for Teacher Education Programs

TABLE 12: QUALITY RATING OF PROGRAM STAFF BY PROGRAM AREA

QUALITY RATING	PROGRAM AREA																			
	(Lim. English Speaking)				(Secondary)				(Post-Secondary)				(Guidance)				(Special Programs)				(Teacher Education)			
	S*	T	C	A	S	T	C	A	S	T	C	A	S	T	C	A	S	T	C	A	S	T	C	A
	%				%				%				%				%				%			
LOW	00.0	00.0	—	20.0	1.0	2.2	00.0	5.5	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	00.0	20.0	00.0	00.0	—	00.0	00.0	00.0	—	00.0
MEDIUM	33.3	50.0	—	20.0	32.3	39.1	23.5	43.6	43.8	41.7	20.0	16.7	25.0	25.0	27.3	40.0	25.0	25.0	—	50.0	00.0	00.0	—	00.0
HIGH	66.7	50.0	—	60.0	66.7	58.7	76.5	50.9	56.2	58.3	80.0	83.3	75.0	75.0	72.7	40.0	75.0	75.0	—	50.0	100.0	100.0	—	100.0
RAW TOTAL	6	6	—	5	102	138	34	55	16	12	5	6	8	4	11	5	8	8	—	2	2	1	—	1
% TOTAL	100	100		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		100	100	100		100

* S - SUPERVISORY T - TEACHER C - COUNSELOR A - AIDE

—— No data for this category

TABLE 16: Rating of Overall Motivation and Dedication of Staff by Program Areas.

	PROGRAM AREAS					
Rating of Overall Mot. and Ded. of Staff	LIMITED ENGLISH SPEAKING	SECONDARY	POST SECONDARY	GUIDANCE	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	TEACHER EDUCATION
Extremely Motivated	2 (20.0)	50 (29.9)	14 (66.7)	9 (56.3)	8 (61.5)	2 (100.0)
Highly Motivated	7 (70.0)	92 (55.1)	5 (23.8)	6 (37.5)	5 (38.5)	____
Somewhat Motivated	1 (10.0)	20 (12.0)	2 (9.5)	1 (6.2)	____	____
Unable to Judge	____	5 (3.0)	____	____	____	____
TOTAL	10 (100%)	167 (100%)	21 (100%)	16 (100%)	13 (100%)	2 (100%)

APPENDIX D: SCALING PROCEDURE FOR DETERMINING QUALITY OF STAFF

The following process was used for determining the quality of program staff:

- For each variable used to measure a dimension of staff quality a set of categories was determined along with a point system to correspond with these categories. This was done separately for these levels of staff positions: supervisory, teacher/counselor, and tutor/aide. Chart 1 specifies the variables used and the corresponding point system.
- A summative scale value for individual staff persons was then calculated according to their position. The possible range of scores for each staff position was: supervisory 0-14; teacher/counselor, 0-13; tutor/aide, 0-9. Because there was missing data on some of the variables, to give the benefit of the doubt, a final score for an individual staff person might exclude in the possible total, the number of points for that missing variable. For example, if a supervisor, Mr. X, did not have anything indicated for "days absent," then the possible total for Mr. X would only be 12, rather than 14. The final summative scale value for individual staff persons was, hence, recorded as a ratio:

$$\frac{\text{total number of points accumulated}}{\text{total number of possible points}}$$

- For any single program, an average quality of staff was determined within each staff position by adding the individual summative scale values (i.e., the number of separate individuals in those staff positions over the duration of the project) and dividing through in order to have the resulting quality rating range between 0-1. For example, Program X might have their staff quality rating calculated like this:

		Summative Scale Value	Average Quality Rating
Supervisory:	Mr. X:	11/12	23/26 = .88
	Miss J:	12/14	
Teacher:	Mrs. T:	10/13	19/24 = .80
	Mr. Y:	9/12	
Counselor	None		left blank
Aide/Tutor:	Miss V:	5/9	12/18 = .67
	Miss O:	7/9	

- For tabulation purposes, the quality ratings ranging between 0-1 were categorized as high; 1.0 - .66, medium, .65 - .33; and low, .32 - .00.

CHART 1. POINT SYSTEM FOR CALCULATING SUMMATIVE SCALE VALUE

Variable	Supervisory Classific./# of Pts.	Teacher/Counselor Classific./# of Pts.	Tutor/Aide Classific./# of Pts.
Educational Background	High School = 0 College/B.A. = 1 M.A./Certif. = 2 Ph.D. = 3	High School = 0 College/B.A. = 1 M.A. & over = 2	No High School Diploma = 0 High School - Training/Cert. = 1 College + = 2
# of Years As Professional Educator	0 - 1 yrs. = 0 2 - 5 yrs. = 1 6 - 10 yrs. = 2 over 10 yrs. = 3	0 yrs. = 0 1 - 2 yrs. = 1 3 - 5 yrs. = 2 over 5 yrs. = 3	0 - 1 yrs. = 0 over 1 yr. = 1
# of Years Working on This Project	Part of project = 0 All of project = 1	Part of project = 0 All of project = 1	Part of project = 0 All of project = 1
# of Years Experience With Disadvantaged	0 - 1 yr. = 0 2 - 5 yrs. = 1 6 - 10 yrs. = 2 over 10 yrs. = 3	0 yr. = 0 1 - 2 yrs. = 1 3 - 5 yrs. = 2 over 5 yrs. = 3	0 - 1 yr. = 0 over 1 yr. = 1
# of Special Training Programs Attended Relating To Project's Focus	0 = 0 1 - 5 or in-service = 1 over 5 = 2	0 = 0 1 - 5 or in-service = 1 over 5 = 2	NOT APPLICABLE
# of Days Absent Throughout Duration of Project	over 5 days per year = 0 1 - 5 days per year = 1 none = 2	over 5 days per year = 0 1 - 5 days per year = 1 none = 2	over 5 days per year = 0 1 - 5 days per year = 1 none = 2
TOTAL # POSSIBLE POINTS	14	13	9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E: LIST OF SITE VISITS

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "The Formulation of an Instructional Resource Team for the Training of Vocational Teachers of Disadvantaged Learners"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 94-2024

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: Jerry Wircenski

LOCATION: Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Friday, April 27, 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

(814) 863-2576

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Vocational Training for School Age Parents"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 88-1007/88-2002

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1980-81/1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: Mrs. Miriam Mednick

LOCATION: 1200 Walnut Street, Philadelphia

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Monday, April 23, 9:00 - 12:00 noon

(215) 545-1190

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Vocational Support Services for Asian and Hispanic Students: A Modified Vocational Training Program"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 67-2004

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: Wilhelmina White

LOCATION: John F. Kennedy Center, Franklin Learning Center, Philadelphia City School District, Philadelphia

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Tuesday, April 24, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

(215) 875-3802

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Guidance Disadvantaged"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 81-9700/81-9750

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1979-80

CONTACT PERSON: Dawn Sinclair

LOCATION: Lehigh County AVTS, 2300 Main Street, Schnecksville

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Wednesday, April 25, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

(215) 799-1372

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "English as a Second Language for Vocational Students"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 67-2002

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: Betsy McHugh

LOCATION: Allegheny County Community College, 610 Smithfield St., Pittsburgh

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Monday, April 30, 1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

(412) 237-2664

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "A.V.E.R.T. - Alternative Vocational Education Readiness Training"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 88-0008/88-1001/88-2001

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1979-80/1980-81/1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: Fred A. Monaco

LOCATION: Pittsburgh Public Schools, 341 S. Bellefield Ave., Pittsburgh

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Tuesday, May 1, 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

(412) 323-3160

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Cont. & Exp. of Diagnosis & Mgt. of Specific Learning Problems of Disadvantaged Vocational Educational Students"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 71-0009/71-1014

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1979-80/1980-81

CONTACT PERSON: Caroline Clark, Director

LOCATION: Community College of Allegheny College, South Campus, 1750 Clairton Rd. West Mifflin, PA

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Wednesday, May 2, 8:30 - 12:00 noon

(412) 469-1100

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Operation Pathway"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 71-0013/71-1007/71-2005

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1979-80/1980-81/1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: George L. Jackson

LOCATION: Gannon University, University Square, Erie, PA

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Friday, April 27, 1:00 - 4:00 p.m.

(814) 871-7455

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Alternative Business Education for the Disadvantaged"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 68-2106

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1981-82

CONTACT PERSON: Shelley Ford/Linda Moehler

LOCATION: McDowell Intermediate High School, Erie

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Tuesday, May 1, 11:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.

(814) 838-4571

BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S PROGRAMS
FOR DISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TITLE OF PROGRAM: "Basic Skills for Educationally Deprived High School Vocational Students"

CONTRACT NUMBERS: 68-9871/68-0866

FISCAL YEAR(S): 1979-80/1980-81

CONTACT PERSON: Victor A. Miller

LOCATION: Blue Mountain School District, Orwigsburg, PA

DATE/TIME OF SITE VISIT: Thursday, April 26, 9:00 - 12:00 p.m.

(717) 366-0515